DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 041 CE 050 254

AUTHOR McGhee, Max B.; And Others
TITLE Follow-up Study of 1975-1985 Agricultural Education Graduates. A Report of Research.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Food and Agricultural Sciences.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 82p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agricultural Education; *College Graduates; Graduate Surveys; Higher Education; *Outcomes of Education; *Participant Satisfaction; *Program Attitudes; Vocational Education; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS *University of Florida

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted (1) to determine the career patterns of graduates in agricultural education from the University of Florida during the period 1975-1985 and (2) to assess their perceptions of the effectiveness of selected aspects of the program in agricultural education in preparing them for careers. Questionnaires were developed and sent to 189 graduates; 129 usable questionnaires were returned. Based on an analysis of the returns, the following results and conclusions were reported: (1) graduates perceived their coursework as above average to good, especially their courses in agricultural education; (2) graduates believed that the amount of preprofessional and agricultural education coursework should be maintained at its present level; (3) graduates perceived the quality of advising and teaching by the faculty to be of very high quality; (4) graduates tended to be male, married, living in small communities, teaching in single teacher vocational agriculture departments, living relatively close to their home towns, and having completed or being in the process of completing education beyond the bachelor's degree; (5) more than 75 percent of the graduates intended to teach vocational agriculture after graduation, and 67 percent of the graduates are currently teachers in some field (60 percent in vocational agriculture); and (6) almost 75 percent of the graduates would major in agricultural education again. Thirty-one tables are included and the study instrument and related correspondence are appended. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295041

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF 1975-1985

AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES

A REPORT OF RESEARCH

MAX B. MCGHEE
JIMMY G. CHEEK
JUAN R. RANCHARAN

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND EXTENSION EDUCATION
INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA

APRIL, 1988

CE050254

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Cheek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writers wish to express their gratitude to the graduates who participated in this study. Without their assistance in completing and returning the survey this study would not have been possible.

Thanks also goes to Mr. Tom Carey and Ms. Lynne Kirkland for their assistance in data collection and document preparation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	2
RESEARCH PROCEDURE	
POPULATION	2
INSTRUMENTATION	3
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES	3
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS	5
FINDINGS	
OBJECTIVE ONE	5
PRE-PROFESSIONAL COURSEWORK	5
TECHNICAL AGRICULTURE COURSEWORK	8
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION COURSEWORK	11
COURSEWORK CHANGES	13
QUALITY OF ADVISEMENT	15
QUALITY OF TEACHING	15
PARTICIPATION AND PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS	17
OBJECTIVE TWO	22
OBJECTIVE THREE	24
CONCLUSIONS	39
RECOMMENDATIONS	40

REFERENCES 66

APPENDICES

A 42

B 44

C 46

D 48

E 50

F 53

G 63

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Number and Percent of Respondents for Each Year of Graduation	4
2.	Perceived Adequacy of Pre-Professional Coursework Received by the Graduates	6
3.	Perceived Adequacy of Technical Agriculture Coursework Received by the Graduates	10
4.	Perceived Adequacy of Agricultural Education Coursework Received by the Graduates	12
5.	Changes Graduates Believe Should be Made in Major Curricular Areas	14
6.	Graduates' Perceptions of the Quality of Advisement by the Agricultural Education Faculty	16
7.	Graduates' Perceptions of the Teaching Behavior of the Agricultural Education Faculty	18
8.	Level of Participation in the Agricultural Education Society	19
9.	Perceived Benefits of Involvement in the Agricultural Education Society	20
10.	Graduates' Membership in Organizations Other Than AES at the University of Florida	22
11.	Marital Status of Graduates	23
12.	Population of the City or Town Where Graduates Currently Live	23
13.	Approximate Distance Between Graduates' Current Residence and Their Hometowns	24
14.	Approximate Distance Between the Current Residence of Graduates' Spouses and Their Hometowns	26
15.	Number and Percent of Graduates in Each Career Category	27

PAGE

16. Graduates' Highest Level of Education. 27

17. Number of Jobs Held After Graduation 28

18. First Job After Graduation from the University of Florida. . . 28

19. Length of Employment on First Job. 29

20. Graduates' Present Jobs. 30

21. Length of Employment on Present Job. 31

22. Annual Gross Salary for Graduates' First Job 32

23. Current Annual Gross Salary for Graduates' Present Job, 1986-1987. 32

24. Vocational Agriculture Teaching Experience 33

25. Type of Department Where Vocational Agricultural Teachers are Currently Teaching 34

26. Length of Vocational Agricultural Teachers' Contract 34

27. Number of Vocational Agricultural Teachers Receiving Salary Supplement. 35

28. Amount of Salary Supplement Received by Vocational Agricultural Teachers. 35

29. Approximate Departmental Budget Allocation for the 1986-1987 School Year. 37

30. Membership of Current Vocational Agriculture Teachers in Professional Organizations. 38

31. Graduates' Intention to Major in Agricultural Education Again. 39

FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF 1975-1985 AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION
GRADUATES FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Introduction

Teacher preparation and the process through which teachers become prepared to teach greatly influence the quality of educational programs conducted in the public schools. Consequently, efforts must be made to evaluate the effectiveness of teacher-preparation programs and the career patterns of graduates. Follow-up studies are one of the most commonly used measures in evaluating educational programs. According to Denton (1979), follow-up data provide faculty with qualitative ratings of the program, perceived needs of the teacher, and insights into skills required in teaching which may not have been stressed by the existing teacher-education program. Additionally, follow-up studies provide evidence regarding the career patterns of graduates.

Although follow-up studies are valuable in providing information regarding student outcomes and program effectiveness, there are reasons of accountability that are also important. They provide evidence of program effectiveness to outside audiences. Neth and Hanson (1976) stated that post-program follow-up studies have traditionally been an integral component of educational research. Recently, as a result of economic and social pressures, there has been a growing demand for accountability, and follow-up studies have received special emphasis.

The role of the vocational agricultural teacher requires competency in a variety of areas. These competencies are derived from the three basic

dimensions of the preservice preparation program: general education, technical agriculture, and professional education. A program that is an appropriate combination of these dimensions should prepare competent and effective teachers (Burnett & Yahya, 1987).

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine the career patterns of graduates in agricultural education from the University of Florida during the period 1975-1985, and to assess their perceptions of the effectiveness of selected aspects of the program in agricultural education in preparing them for careers.

Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Determine the perceptions of graduates regarding the quality of selected educational experiences at the University of Florida and the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education.
2. Identify demographic characteristics regarding agricultural education graduates.
3. Identify the professional characteristics regarding agricultural education graduates.

Research Procedure

Population

The population for the study consisted of all agricultural education graduates, both bachelor and/or master's degrees recipients, for the years 1975 to 1985, who completed student teaching and teacher certification coursework while pursuing their degrees at the University of Florida. Names and the last known addresses of graduates were obtained from student files, the Office of the Dean for Resident Instruction, or through personal contact. As a result, 189 agricultural education graduates were identified.

Instrumentation

In order to obtain requisite information, a mail questionnaire (Appendix F) was developed to gather data from graduates. The questionnaire was reviewed by faculty members and field tested with graduate students in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education to insure content validity. Instrument reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha. The alpha values were as follows: pre-professional courses (.80), technical agriculture courses (.89), agricultural education courses (.88), student advisement (.81), teaching behaviors of faculty (.74), and benefits of the Agricultural Education Society (.96).

Data Collection Procedures

Data for the study were collected between September 22, 1986 through December 10, 1986. All 189 graduates identified were sent a cover letter (Appendix A) and a questionnaire (Appendix F). The graduates were encouraged to return the completed questionnaire by October 1, 1986. A follow-up letter (Appendix B) with a questionnaire was mailed on October 20 to graduates who had not responded. A second follow-up letter (Appendix C) was sent a week later, October 27, 1986.

Several letters were returned by the Postal Service and after new addresses were acquired a second mail out (Appendix D) was conducted on October 28, 1986. Thereafter, two follow-up letters (Appendix E) were sent on November 4 and 7, 1986 to non-respondents.

Eleven weeks after the initial mailing, 29 questionnaires were returned by the Postal Service as being undeliverable and new addresses could not be identified. Table 1 reflects the number and percent of respondents in each graduation class who received a questionnaire. It may be noted that one class exhibited 100% response, three classes fell between

90% and 100%, three between 80% and 90%, and four lower than 80%. The overall response was 83.75%. Of these, forty-three (32.1%) were females and ninety-one (67.9%) were males. It was assumed that 160 graduates received the questionnaire. A total of 134 (83.75%) completed questionnaires were received from former students. Five questionnaires were rendered unusable. From the 29 non-respondents, a random sample of 5 non-respondents was drawn and telephoned. They were asked to respond to selected items on the questionnaire. An analysis of this information revealed no significant differences between respondents and non-respondents.

Table 1
Number and Percent of Respondents for Each Year of Graduation

Year of Graduation	Number of Graduates	Number of Contacted Graduates	Number of Respondents	Response Percentage
1975	15	13	7	53.85
1976	13	10	7	70.00
1977	19	12	12	100.00
1978	19	12	8	66.67
1979	22	18	16	88.89
1980	17	16	14	87.50
1981	19	19	16	84.21
1982	17	15	14	93.33
1983	11	8	6	75.00
1984	25	25	23	92.00
1985	12	12	11	91.67
Total	189	160	134	83.80

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were utilized to analyze the data relative to the first three objectives.

Findings

Objective One

Objective one was designed to determine the perceptions of graduates regarding the quality of selected educational experiences at the University of Florida and the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education.

Pre-Professional Coursework

Table 2 reflects the perceived adequacy of pre-professional coursework received by the graduates. Seven categories of coursework were utilized including English, social and behavioral sciences, humanities, mathematics, economics, science, and communications, as well as a category concerning students' perceptions of the overall adequacy of the pre-professional program. Respondents were asked to respond on a five-point scale ranging from poor to excellent, with poor corresponding to a value of one and excellent to a value of five.

Table 2
Perceived Adequacy of Pre-Professional Coursework Received by the Graduates

Pre-Professional Courses	Adequacy of Coursework Frequency (f) and Percent (%)										Mean Response*
	Poor		Fair		Average		Good		Excellent		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
English	3	2.3	6	4.7	47	36.7	64	50.0	8	6.3	3.53
Social and Behavioral Sciences	0	0.0	9	6.9	51	39.2	64	49.2	6	4.6	3.52
Humanities	6	4.7	11	8.5	44	34.1	56	43.4	12	9.3	3.44
Mathematics	0	0.0	9	7.0	32	24.8	67	51.9	21	16.3	3.78
Economics	3	2.3	16	12.4	33	25.6	58	45.0	19	14.7	3.57
Sciences (Chemistry, etc.)	0	0.0	9	7.0	27	20.9	66	51.2	27	20.9	3.86
Communications (Speech and Ag. Journalism)	2	1.5	7	5.4	38	29.2	56	43.1	27	20.8	3.76
Overall Adequacy**	0	0.0	5	3.9	36	27.9	84	65.1	4	3.1	3.67

* Rating Scale: Poor=1; Fair=2; Average=3; Good=4; Excellent=5.
** Overall adequacy was rated separately and does not represent the arithmetical mean of the Pre-Professional courses.

The mean response ranged from a high of 3.86 for the sciences to a low of 3.44 for the humanities.

Sixty-four (50%) of the respondents rated the adequacy of English courses as good and three (2.3%) rated the adequacy as poor. The mean response was 3.53. Sixty-four (49.2%) respondents believed the coursework in the social and behavioral sciences was good while fifty-one (39.2%) indicated it was average. The mean response was 3.52. Fifty-six (43.4%) believed the adequacy of coursework in humanities was good, while forty-four (34.1%) stated it was average. Twelve (9.3%) respondents stated that the coursework was excellent while six (4.7%) indicated that it was poor. The mean response was 3.44.

Sixty-seven (51.9%) indicated that the adequacy of their mathematics coursework was good. Twenty-one (16.3%) rated the adequacy of mathematics as excellent while none of the respondents chose poor. The mean response for mathematics was 3.78.

The adequacy of economics coursework was rated as good by fifty-eight (45%) of the respondents and average by thirty-three (25.6%). The mean response was 3.57.

The adequacy of science courses (chemistry, biology, physics) was rated as good by sixty-six (51.2%) of the respondents. Twenty-seven (20.9%) rated the adequacy as excellent. The sciences received the highest mean response which was 3.86.

Fifty-six (43.1%) indicated that the adequacy of communications was good while thirty-eight (29.2%) chose average and another twenty-seven (20.8%) chose excellent. The mean response was 3.76.

The overall adequacy of the pre-professional courses was rated as good by eighty-four (65.1%) of the respondents. Only four (3.1%) of the

respondents rated the overall adequacy as excellent. The mean response for the overall adequacy of pre-professional courses was 3.67.

Technical Agriculture Coursework

Table 3 reflects the perceived adequacy of technical agriculture coursework received by the graduates. The seven categories involved coursework required by the Agricultural and Extension Education Department. These included agricultural economics, agricultural mechanics, agronomy, animal science, entomology, horticulture, and soils. The "other" category was offered as a "fill-in-the-blank" to allow respondents to list and give their opinions of the adequacy of technical agriculture electives such as fruit crops, vegetable crops, and forestry. Respondents were asked to respond on a five-point scale that ranged from poor to excellent with poor equaling one and five equaling excellent.

The mean response ranged from a low of 3.41 for soils coursework to a high of 4.14 for animal science coursework. Forty-eight (36.4%) of the respondents indicated that the adequacy of agricultural economics coursework was good while thirty-nine (29.5%) believed its adequacy was average. The mean response was 3.56. Forty-three (32.8%) respondents believed the adequacy of the agricultural mechanics courses was good while forty-one (31.3%) believed that it was excellent. Six (4.6%) rated the adequacy as poor. The mean response was 3.77. Forty-four (35.2%) perceived the adequacy of agronomy coursework they received as good while the same number indicated it was average. The mean response ranked second lowest at 3.48. Fifty-nine (44.4%) stated that the adequacy of animal science coursework was good while forty-eight (36.1%) felt it was excellent. Animal science coursework received the highest mean response (4.14). Fifty-four (40.6%) believed that the adequacy of

entomology coursework was good while another forty-one (30.8%) indicated that the adequacy was excellent. Entomology coursework received one of the highest mean responses of 3.96. Forty-one (32.3%) indicated that the adequacy of coursework in horticulture was good while another thirty-seven (29.1%) believed it was average. The mean response was 3.59. Fifty-one (38.6%) stated that the adequacy of soils coursework was good while another forty (30.3%) perceived it as average. The mean response for soils was the lowest among the categories at 3.41. The "other" category included technical agriculture electives that are not required by the Agricultural and Extension Education Department. Thirteen respondents identified the following other elective course areas: citrus/fruit crops (5), forestry (3), and one each filled in natural resources, dairy science, meat science, vegetable crops, and crops respectively. Of these, (60%) indicated that the adequacy of these courses was excellent with three (13.3%) each rating these courses as fair, average, or good.

The overall adequacy of technical agriculture coursework was rated as good by seventy-two (55%) and average by thirty-seven (28.2%) of the respondents. The mean response was 3.82. The overall adequacy was rated separately and does not represent the arithmetical mean of the individual technical agriculture course ratings.

Table 3
Perceived Adequacy of Technical Agriculture Coursework Received by the Graduates

Technical Agriculture Courses	Adequacy of Coursework Frequency (f) and Percent (%)										Mean Response*
	Poor		Fair		Average		Good		Excellent		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Agricultural Economics	4	3.0	16	12.1	39	29.5	48	36.4	25	18.9	3.56
Agricultural Mechanics	6	4.6	12	9.2	29	22.1	43	32.8	41	31.3	3.77
Agronomy	4	3.2	14	11.2	44	35.2	44	35.2	19	15.2	3.48
Animal Science	1	0.8	1	0.8	24	18.0	59	44.4	48	36.1	4.14
Entomology	2	1.5	4	3.0	32	24.1	54	40.6	41	30.8	3.96
Horticulture	4	3.1	16	12.6	37	29.1	41	32.3	29	22.8	3.59
Soils	4	3.0	21	15.9	40	30.3	51	38.6	16	12.1	3.41
Other	0	0.0	2	13.3	2	13.3	2	13.3	9	60.0	4.85
Overall Adequacy**	0	0.0	3	2.3	37	28.2	72	55.0	19	14.5	3.82

* Rating Scale: Poor=1; Fair=2; Average=3; Good=4; Excellent=5.
** Overall adequacy was rated separately and does not represent the arithmetical mean of the Technical Agriculture courses.

Agricultural Education Coursework

Table 4 reflects the perceived adequacy of agricultural education coursework received by the graduates. The six categories appearing in the table are teaching methods, special methods of teaching agriculture, youth programs, program planning, principles and philosophy, and student teaching/internship. The mean responses in Table 4 ranged from a high of 4.08 for student teaching/internship to a low of 3.78 for youth programs.

Sixty-three (47.7%) of the respondents perceived the adequacy of teaching methods coursework as good while another thirty-five (26.5%) stated that the adequacy was excellent. The mean response for the adequacy of teaching methods coursework was 3.98. Fifty-nine (44.7%) indicated that the adequacy of special methods of teaching agriculture was good while thirty-six (27.3%) indicated it was excellent. The mean response was 3.92. Forty-nine (37.7%) asserted that the adequacy of youth programs coursework was good while another thirty-five (26.9%) stated that it was excellent. Two (1.5%) of the respondents indicated that the adequacy was poor and another fourteen (10.8%) indicated that the adequacy was fair. This category had the lowest mean response of 3.78. Sixty-four (48.5%) perceived the adequacy of program planning coursework as good while 29 (22%) was the score for both the average and excellent categories. The mean response was 3.84. Fifty-eight (44.3%) attested that the adequacy of principles and philosophy coursework was good while another thirty-four (26%) stated that it was excellent. The mean response was 3.89. Sixty-one (46.6%) stated that the adequacy of their student teaching/internship was excellent while another forty-one (31.3%) indicated that it was good. This category received the highest mean response of 4.08. It should be pointed out, however, that five (3.8%) respondents believed the adequacy of student teaching/internship was poor.

Table 4
Perceived Adequacy of Agricultural Education Coursework Received by the Graduates

Agricultural Education Courses	Adequacy of Coursework Frequency (f) and Percent (%)										Mean Response*
	Poor		Fair		Average		Good		Excellent		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Teaching Methods	1	0.8	2	1.5	31	23.5	63	47.7	35	26.5	3.98
Special Methods of Teaching	1	0.8	7	5.3	29	22.0	59	44.7	36	27.3	3.92
Youth Programs	2	1.5	14	10.8	30	23.1	49	37.7	35	26.9	3.78
Program Planning	1	0.8	9	6.8	29	22.0	64	48.5	29	22.0	3.84
Principles and Philosophy	0	0.0	10	7.6	29	22.1	58	44.3	34	26.0	3.89
Student Teaching/ Internship	5	3.8	12	9.2	12	9.2	41	31.3	61	46.6	4.08
Overall Adequacy**	0	0.0	5	3.8	25	19.1	70	53.4	31	23.7	4.00

* Rating Scale: Poor=1; Fair=2; Average=3; Good=4; Excellent=5.
** Overall adequacy was rated separately and does not represent the arithmetical mean of the Agricultural Education courses.

The overall adequacy was rated as good by seventy (53.4%) respondents while thirty-one (23.7%) perceived it as excellent. The mean response was 4.00.

Most respondents indicated that the overall adequacy of Pre-Professional, Technical Agriculture, and Agricultural Education coursework was satisfactory (See Tables 2, 3, and 4). The mean response for Pre-Professional and Technical Agriculture coursework was 3.67 and 3.82 respectively, indicating a mean somewhere between average and good. The mean response for Agricultural Education coursework was 4.00, indicating a mean rating of good.

Coursework Changes

Table 5 reflects the changes graduates believe should be made in the major curricular areas. The respondents were asked if the coursework should be decreased, maintained, or increased in each of three of the required categories which included pre-professional, technical agriculture, and agricultural education courses.

Concerning pre-professional coursework, one hundred seven (81.1%) of the respondents indicated that the required coursework should be maintained, fourteen (10.6%) indicated that it should be decreased, and eleven (8.3%) indicated that it should be increased. Relative to technical agricultural courses, ninety-five (70.9%) believed that the coursework should be increased, thirty-eight (28.4%) believed it should be maintained, and one (0.7%) indicated that it should be decreased. Concerning agricultural education courses, eighty-eight (66.2%) believed that the coursework should be maintained, twenty-four (18%) believed it should be increased, and twenty-one (15.8%) believed it should be decreased.

Table 5
Changes Graduates Believe Should be Made in Major Curricular Areas

Major Curricular Areas	Frequency and Percent Responses					
	Should be Decreased		Should be Maintained		Should be Increased	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Pre-Professional Courses	14	10.6	107	81.1	11	8.3
Technical Agricultural Courses	1	0.7	38	28.4	95	70.9
Agricultural Education Courses	21	15.8	88	66.2	24	18.0

Quality of Advisement

Data in Table 6 reflect the perceptions of the quality of advisement by the agricultural education faculty. Respondents were able to choose between strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, and strongly agree in referring to the types of advisement listed. Numerical values were assigned to each of the choices and ranged from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree.

Most respondents perceived the quality of advisement they received from faculty as very satisfactory. The respondents, for the most part, chose agree or strongly agree concerning the different types of advisement listed in Table 6. One hundred eight (81.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that faculty helped them get the experience that they wanted in college while six (4.5%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement. The mean response was 4.5. One hundred thirteen (84.9%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the faculty made an effort to become acquainted with their problems; while five (3.7%) respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (mean = 4.3). One hundred six (83.4%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the faculty provided information and assistance for further education while six (4.7%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement (mean = 4.3).

Quality of Teaching

Table 7 reflects the graduates' perceptions of the teaching behavior of the agricultural education faculty. The respondents were asked to choose strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree or strongly agree for each type of teaching behavior listed. These behaviors included: clarity in presentation, used a variety of teaching methods, alert and enthusiastic about subject, task oriented (stayed on subject), and asked questions and used student ideas.

Table 6
Graduates' Perceptions of the Quality of Advisement by the Agricultural Education Faculty

Type of Advisement	Quality of Advisement Frequency (f) and Percent (%)										
	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	Mean Response*
Helped get courses needed	1	0.7	3	2.2	3	2.2	48	35.8	79	59.0	4.5
Helped get experience wanted in college	1	0.7	5	3.8	19	14.3	63	47.4	45	33.8	3.7
Well qualified to advise students	0	0.0	1	0.8	4	3.0	54	40.6	74	55.6	4.5
Readily available when needed	0	0.0	5	3.7	11	8.1	46	34.1	73	54.1	4.4
Friendly and cooperative	0	0.0	2	1.5	4	3.0	33	24.6	95	70.9	4.6
Made effort to become acquainted with my problem	1	0.7	4	3.0	15	11.3	51	38.3	62	46.6	4.3
Appeared happy to be of assistance	0	0.0	3	2.2	7	5.2	42	31.3	82	61.2	4.5
Provided information and assistance for further education	1	0.8	5	3.9	15	11.8	44	34.6	62	48.8	4.3
Provided information and assistance in getting a job	0	0.0	7	5.9	14	11.9	40	33.9	57	48.3	4.2

*Rating Scale: Strongly Disagree=1; Disagree=2; Undecided=3; Agree=4; and Strongly Agree=5.

Most respondents were well satisfied with the teaching behavior displayed by the faculty. The frequency of responses indicating that respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the types of teaching behavior listed in Table 7 far outnumbered those choosing a response of average, disagree, and strongly disagree. Mean response values were all either 4.3 or 4.4 indicating that the respondents perceived teaching quality to be quite high.

One type of behavior received a significant response toward the lower end of the scale. One hundred twenty (90.3%) agreed or strongly agreed that the faculty used a variety of teaching methods while ten (7.5%) respondents disagreed with this statement although the overall mean response value was 4.3.

Participation and Perceptions of Student Organizations

Table 8 reflects graduates' participation in the Agricultural Education Society (AES), formerly called the Collegiate FFA. The four levels of participation included: not a member, paid dues but not involved, somewhat actively involved, and very actively involved.

Forty-eight (36.1%) of the respondents stated that they were somewhat actively involved while forty-five (33.8%) stated that they were very actively involved. The remaining 30% were either not a member or paid their dues but were not involved.

Table 7
Graduates' Perceptions of the Teaching Behavior of the Agricultural Education Faculty

Type of Teaching Behavior	Quality of Teaching Behavior Frequency (f) and Percent (%)										Mean Response*
	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Undecided		Agree		Strongly Agree		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Clarity in presentation	0	0.0	2	1.5	4	3.0	75	56.4	52	39.1	4.4
Used variety of teaching methods	0	0.0	10	7.5	3	2.3	59	44.4	61	45.9	4.3
Alert and enthusiastic about subject	0	0.0	3	2.2	8	6.0	58	43.3	65	48.5	4.4
Task oriented (stayed on subject)	0	0.0	1	0.8	3	2.3	68	51.1	61	45.9	4.4
Asked questions and used student ideas	0	0.0	4	3.0	11	8.2	62	46.3	57	42.5	4.3

*Rating Scale: Strongly Disagree=1; Disagree=2; Undecided=3; Agree=4; and Strongly Agree=5.

Table 8
Level of Participation in the Agricultural Education Society

Level of participation	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Not a member	26	19.5
Paid dues but not involved	14	10.5
Somewhat actively involved	48	36.1
Very actively involved	45	33.8

Table 9 reflects the value of involvement in the Agricultural Education Society (AES) as perceived by graduates. The involvement values the graduates were able to choose from were none, little, some, much, and very much with numeric values assigned 1 to 5 respectively. The benefits that were rated were: helped me understand agricultural education/vocational agriculture, helped me develop leadership skills, helped me accept and carry out responsibilities, helped me work with people, helped me develop job skills, and made me aware of career possibilities.

Forty-one (41%) indicated that the AES had some value in helping understand Agricultural Education/Vocational Agriculture while twenty-two (22%) perceived much value in this area from their involvement in AES. Twenty-three (23%) stated that they received little or no value in understanding agricultural education/vocational agriculture by their involvement in AES. The mean response was 3.2.

Thirty-nine (39%) indicated that there was much or very much value in helping develop leadership skills. Twenty-five (25%) stated that their involvement in AES had little or no value in helping develop leadership skills. The remaining thirty-six (36%) indicated that their involvement in AES had some value in this area. The mean response was 3.2.

Table 9
Perceived Benefits of Involvement in the Agricultural Education Society

Benefits	Involvement Value Frequency (f) and Percent (%) None f	%	Little f	%	Some f	%	Much f	%	Very Much f	%	Mean Response*
Helped me understand Agricultural Education/Vocational Agriculture	7	7.0	16	16.0	41	41.0	22	22.0	14	14.0	3.2
Helped me develop leadership skills	8	8.0	17	17.0	36	36.0	22	22.0	17	17.0	3.2
Helped me accept and carry out responsibilities	6	6.0	14	14.0	31	31.0	32	32.0	17	17.0	3.4
Helped me work with people	5	5.0	9	9.0	32	32.0	33	33.0	21	21.0	3.6
Helped me develop job skills	11	11.1	24	24.2	27	27.3	17	17.2	20	20.2	3.1
Made me aware of career possibilities	13	13.0	26	26.0	28	28.0	17	17.0	16	16.0	3.0

*Rating Scale: None=1; Little=2; Some=3; Much=4; Very Much=5.

Forty-nine (49%) indicated that they received much or very much value from their involvement in AES in helping accept and carry out responsibilities. Twenty (20%) perceived getting little or no value in this area from their involvement in AES. The remaining thirty-one (31%) stated that they received some value. The mean response was 3.4.

Fifty-four (54%) perceived much or very much value in helping them work with people from their involvement in AES. Fourteen (14%) indicated that they received little or no value in helping them work with people. Thirty-two (32%) stated that they received some value in helping them work with people from their involvement in AES. The mean response was 3.6.

Thirty-seven (37.4%) indicated much or very much involvement value in AES with helping develop job skills. Thirty-five (35.3%) stated that they perceived little or no value in helping develop job skills from their involvement in AES. Twenty-seven (27.3%) perceived some value in their involvement in AES concerning helping develop job skills. The mean response was 3.1.

Thirty-three (33%) perceived much or very much value concerning being made aware of career possibilities while involved in the AES while thirty-nine (39%) perceived little or no value. Twenty-eight (28%) felt some value. The mean response was 3.0.

A total of 133 graduates responded to the question regarding membership in organizations other than AES. Ninety-two indicated they belonged to one or more organizations and forty-one (30.8%) indicated they did not belong to any other organization. Table 10 reflects graduates' membership in other organizations at the University of Florida. Alpha Zeta, Gamma Sigma Delta, and Alpha Gamma Rho were the most frequently indicated organizations.

Table 10
Graduates' Membership in Organizations Other than AES at the University of Florida

Organization	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Agricultural Student Council	16	17.4
Agronomy-Soils Club	4	4.3
Alpha Gamma Rho	22	23.9
Alpha Zeta	38	41.3
Block and Bridle	30	32.6
Gamma Sigma Delta	22	23.9
Other	34	37.0

Objective Two

Objective 2 was designed to identify the following demographic information regarding agricultural education graduates: age, sex, marital status, current geographic location of employment, size of community where they are now living, and distance from hometown to the community in which they currently reside.

There were 43 (32.1%) female respondents and 91 (67.9%) males. Table 11 reflects the marital status of the graduates. Eighty-eight (66.2%) were married while thirty-four (25.6%) were single. The remaining eleven (8.3%) were either separated, divorced, or widowed.

Table 12 reflects the population of the city or town where the graduates currently live. Fifty (38.5%) live in towns or cities with populations less than 10,000. Twenty-seven (20.8%) live where the population is between 10,000 and 29,999 and twenty-two (16.9%) live in cities or towns of over 100,000.

Table 11
Marital Status of Graduates

Marital Status	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Single	34	25.6
Married	88	66.2
Separated	2	1.5
Divorced	8	6.0
Widowed	1	0.8

Table 12
Population of the City or Town Where Graduates Currently Live

Population	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Less than 10,000	50	38.5
10,000 29,999	27	20.8
30,000 49,999	12	9.2
50,000 100,000	19	14.6
Over 100,000	22	16.9

Table 13 reflects the approximate distance between the city/town graduates currently live and their hometown. Sixty-one (47.7%) of the respondents indicated they lived less than 49 miles from their hometown. Twenty-eight (21.9%) indicated they were between 50 and 149 miles from their hometown. The rest of the respondents were fairly evenly spread in each of the brackets from 150 to greater than 1,500 miles.

Table 13
Approximate Distance Between Graduates' Current Residence and Their Hometowns

Miles from Hometown	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Less than 49	61	47.7
50 - 99	12	9.4
100 - 149	16	12.5
150 - 199	7	5.5
200 - 299	8	6.3
300 - 399	4	3.1
400 - 499	2	1.6
500 - 599	3	2.3
600 - 999	4	3.1
1,000 - 1,499	5	3.9
Greater than 1,500	6	4.7

Table 14 reflects the approximate distance between the current residence of graduates' spouses and their hometown. Thirty-six (43.9%) indicated that their spouses were less than 49 miles from their hometown. Twenty-one (25.6%) indicated their spouses were between 50 and 199 miles from their hometown. Fourteen (17.1%) indicated their spouses were 1,000 miles or greater from their hometown.

Objective Three

Objective 3 was designed to identify the following professional information regarding agricultural education graduates: present position; number of positions held since graduation; salary; current level of education; if teaching, number of years taught, length of contract, size of

department; professional affiliation; and if starting college again, would they enroll in agricultural education.

Table 15 displays the number and percent of graduates in each of three career categories according to year of graduation. The career categories are: current teachers, former teachers, and those who never taught vocational agriculture. A total of eighty-one (60.4%) respondents were employed as vocational agricultural teachers when surveyed; sixteen (11.9%) were formerly employed as vocational agricultural teachers while thirty-seven (27.6%) had never taught vocational agriculture.

A high percentage of the graduates from 1984 (95.5%) were actively employed as vocational agricultural teachers. In fact, only one of a total of twenty-two graduates from that year was not employed as a vocational agricultural teacher. At the other end of the scale, only two (28.6%) 1975 graduates were still employed as vocational agricultural teachers, with four others (57.1%) from that year indicating former teaching experience and one (14.3%) non-teacher.

Table 16 reflects the graduates' highest level of education. Forty-three (32.3%) indicated they earned an undergraduate degree while forty-three (32.3%) of the respondents indicated they had taken some graduate courses. Thirty-five (26.3%) indicated having earned a master's degree while eleven (8.3%) indicated earning a master's degree along with additional graduate courses. One (0.8%) indicated earning a Ph.D.

Table 17 reflects the number of jobs held after graduation from the University of Florida. Fifty-six (42.7%) indicated they held one job since graduation. Sixty-four (48.9%) indicated they have held two to three different jobs after graduation. Ten (7.6%) indicated they have held four to five jobs. Only one (0.8%) respondent indicated having held six jobs since graduation. The data indicate that whether or not the graduates

chose a teaching or non-teaching profession, they tended to remain in their first or second job.

Table 18 reflects the graduates' first job after graduation from the University of Florida. Most of the respondents, one hundred and three (76.9%), indicated that their first job was as an agricultural education instructor at the high school level. Twelve (9%) indicated their first job was in agribusiness.

Table 14
Approximate Distance Between the Current Residence of Graduates' Spouses and Their Hometowns

Miles from Hometown	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Less than 49	36	43.9
50 - 99	8	9.8
100 - 149	7	8.5
150 - 199	6	7.3
200 - 299	3	3.7
300 - 399	3	3.7
400 - 499	1	1.2
500 - 599	1	1.2
600 - 999	3	3.7
1,000 - 1,499	8	9.8
Greater than 1,500	6	7.3

Table 15
Number and Percent of Graduates in Each Career Category

Year of Graduation	Current Teachers		Former Teachers		Never Taught	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1975	2	28.6	4	57.1	1	14.3
1976	3	42.9	4	57.1		
1977	8	66.7	4	33.3		
1978	3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5
1979	8	50.0	4	25.0	4	25.0
1980	9	64.3	2	14.3	3	21.4
1981	10	66.7	2	13.3	3	20.0
1982	9	64.3	1	7.1	4	28.6
1983	5	83.3	1	16.7		
1984	21	95.5	1	4.5		
1985	11	91.7			1	8.3
Total	89	66.9	27	20.3	17	12.8

Table 16
Graduates' Highest Level of Education

	Responses	
Level	Frequency	Percent
Undergraduate Degree	43	32.3
Undergraduate Degree and Graduate Courses	43	32.3
Master's Degree	35	26.3
Master's Degree and Graduate Courses	11	8.3
Ph.D.	1	0.8

Table 17
Number of Jobs Held After Graduation

Number of Jobs Held After Graduation From the University of Florida	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
1	56	42.7
2	44	33.6
3	20	15.3
4	7	5.3
5	3	2.3
6	1	0.8

Table 18
First Job After Graduation from the University of Florida

Job Description	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Agricultural Education Instructor High School Level	103	76.9
Agricultural Education Instructor University Level	1	0.7
Extension Service	1	0.7
Non-Agricultural Instructor	4	3.0
Agribusiness	12	9.0
Self Employed	5	3.7
Business	6	4.5
Other	2	1.5

Table 19 reflects the length of employment on the first job held by the graduates. Forty-five (34.6%) held or are holding their first job for one year. Twenty-six (20%) held or are holding their first job for a length of two years. Twenty-seven (20.8%) indicated holding their first job for a period of three to four years. Eleven (8.5%) indicated holding their first job for ten years or more.

Table 19
Length of Employment on First Job

Length of Employment (Years)	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
1	45	34.6
2	26	20.0
3	17	13.1
4	10	7.7
5	5	3.8
6	7	5.4
7	3	2.3
8	4	3.1
9	2	1.5
10 or Greater	11	8.5

Table 20 reflects the graduates' present jobs. Seventy-nine (59.4%) of the respondents indicated they were currently employed as agricultural education instructors at the high school level. Fifteen (11.3%) indicated they were employed in agribusiness. Nine (6.8%) indicated they were employed as non-agricultural instructors.

Table 20
Graduates' Present Jobs

Job Description	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Vocational Agriculture Teacher	79	59.4
Agricultural Education Instructor University Level	2	1.5
Agricultural Extension Service	2	1.5
Vocational Education Personnel	3	2.3
Full-Time Agricultural Student	3	2.3
Non-Agricultural Instructor	9	6.8
Agribusiness	15	11.3
Self Employed	6	4.5
Business	6	4.5
Other	8	6.0

Table 21 reflects the graduates' length of employment at their present job. Twenty-six (20.5%) of the respondents indicated they were currently employed for one year or less. Twenty-seven (21.3%) indicated they were currently employed for two years. Twenty-six (20.4%) indicated they were employed for three to four years. Thirteen (10.2%) indicated they were employed for ten or more years in their present job.

Table 22 reflects the annual gross salary for the graduates' first job. Sixty-seven (51.1%) indicated earning between $10,000-14,999 annual

Table 21
Length of Employment on Present Job

Length of Employment (Years)	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
1	26	20.5
2	27	21.3
3	13	10.2
4	13	10.2
5	9	7.1
6	13	10.2
7	7	5.5
8	3	2.4
9	3	2.4
10 or Greater	13	10.2

gross salary for their first job. Thirty-three (25.2%) indicated earning between $15,000-19,999. Eighteen (13.7%) indicated earning less than $10,000 while twelve (9.2%) indicated earning $20,000-24,999. Only one (0.8%) indicated earning more than $30,000.

Table 23 reflects the annual gross salary for the graduates' present job. Forty-nine (39.8%) indicated current annual earnings between $20,000-24,999. Thirty-three (26.8%) indicated earning between $15,000-19,999, sixteen (13%) indicated earning between $25,000-29,999, five (4.1%) indicated earning below $10,000, and five (4.1%) indicated earning greater than $40,000. Current annual gross salary of graduates partitioned by year of graduation, by length of contract, and teacher and non-teacher is presented in Appendix G.

Table 22
Annual Gross Salary for Graduates' First Job

	Responses	
Salary	Frequency	Percent
Below $10,000	18	13.7
$10,000 - $14,999	67	51.1
$15,000 - $19,999	33	25.2
$20,000 - $24,999	12	9.2
$25,000 - $29,999	0	0.0
$30,000 - $34,999	1	0.8
$35,000 - $39,999	0	0.0
$40,000 and above	0	0.0

Table 23
Current Annual Gross Salary for Graduates' Present Job, 1986-1987

	Responses	
Salary	Frequency	Percent
Below $10,000	5	4.1
$10,000 - $14,999	5	4.1
$15,000 - $19,999	33	26.8
$20,000 - $24,999	49	39.8
$25,000 - $29,999	16	13.0
$30,000 - $34,999	8	6.5
$35,000 - $39,999	2	1.6
$40,000 and above	5	4.1

Table 24 reflects the years of vocational agricultural teaching experience of the graduates. Twenty-one (17.8%) indicated having two years of teaching experience. Nineteen (16.1%) indicated having one year or less teaching experience while eighteen (15.3%) indicated having three years teaching experience. Twelve (10.1%) indicated having ten or more years experience.

Table 24
Vocational Agriculture Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience (Years)	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
1	19	16.1
2	21	17.8
3	18	15.3
4	10	8.5
5	7	5.9
6	14	11.9
7	8	6.8
8	5	4.2
9	4	3.4
10	7	5.9
Over 10	5	4.2

Table 25 reflects the type of department in which the vocational agriculture teachers are teaching. Forty-one (52.6%) indicated they were currently teaching in single teacher departments while thirty-seven (47.4%) indicated they were currently teaching in multi-teacher departments.

Table 25
Type of Department Where Vocational Agricultural Teachers are Currently Teaching

	Responses	
Type of Department	Frequency	Percent
Single Teacher	41	52.6
Multi-Teacher	37	47.4

Table 26 reflects the vocational agricultural teachers' length of contract. Thirty (37.5%) indicated their length of contract was twelve months. Eighteen (22.5%) indicated their length of contract was ten months while seven (8.8%) indicated their contract was eleven months. Twenty-five (31.3%) indicated their contract was other than 10, 11, or 12 months.

Table 26
Length of Vocational Agricultural Teachers' Contract

	Responses	
Length of Contract	Frequency	Percent
10 Months	18	22.5
11 Months	7	8.8
12 Months	30	37.5
Other	25	31.3

Table 27 reflects the number of vocational agricultural teachers receiving a salary supplement. Seventy-one (88.8%) indicated they did receive a salary supplement while nine (11.2%) indicated they did not receive a salary supplement.

Table 27
Number of Vocational Agricultural Teachers Receiving Salary Supplement

	Responses	
Salary Supplement	Frequency	Percent
Yes	71	88.8
No	9	11.2

Table 28 reflects the amount of salary supplement received by vocational agricultural teachers. Twenty-six (40%) indicated they received between $1,000-1,499, eleven (16.9%) indicated they received between $500-999 while another eleven (16.9%) indicated they received between $1,500-1,999.

Table 28
Amount of Salary Supplement Received by Vocational Agricultural Teachers

	Responses	
Salary Supplement	Frequency	Percent
1 - 499	4	6.2
500 - 999	11	16.9
1,000 - 1,499	26	40.0
1,500 - 1,999	11	16.9
2,000 - 2,499	7	10.8
2,500 - 2,999	5	7.7
As Needed	1	1.5

Table 29 reflects the approximate departmental budget allocation for the 1986-1987 school year. The amounts of allocation are broken down into

$500 brackets from $1.00 to $3,499. The respondents could also choose greater than $3,500 or none to indicate the amount of allocation. The columns in the table are broken down into travel budget, operating budget, and equipment budget.

Thirteen (22.8%) of the respondents indicated their travel budget was between $500-999 while twelve (21.1%) indicated their travel budget was between $1-499. Five (8.8%) indicated they had no travel budget while only one (1.8%) indicated having a travel budget over $3,500. Twelve (21.1%) respondents indicated functioning under an "as needed" travel budget.

Nineteen (30.2%) indicated having an operating budget between $500-999 while fifteen (23.8%) indicated an operating budget between $1,000-1,499. Three (4.8%) indicated having no operating budget while two (3.2%) indicated an operating budget of over $3,500. Four (6.3%) indicated having an operating budget on an "as needed" basis.

Fifteen (30%) indicated having an equipment budget on an "as needed" basis. Eight (16%) indicated having no equipment budget. The remainder of the respondents fell fairly evenly within each of the $500 brackets indicated in the table. Only one (2.0%) indicated having an equipment budget greater than $3,500.

A total of eighty current teachers of vocational agriculture are included in Table 30 which represents teacher membership in professional organizations. Membership was highest in the Florida Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association with fifty-two (65.0%). Thirty-six respondents (45.0%) indicated membership in the Florida Vocational Association and thirty-four (42.5%) in the National Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association.

Table 29
Approximate Departmental Budget Allocation for the 1986-1987 School Year

Amount of Allocation	Budget					
	Travel		Operating		Equipment	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
None	5	8.8	3	4.8	8	16.0
1 - 499	12	21.1	12	19.0	5	10.0
500 - 999	13	22.8	19	30.2	5	10.0
1,000 - 1,499	9	15.8	15	23.8	4	8.0
1,500 - 1,999	2	3.5	4	6.3	6	12.0
2,000 - 2,499	2	3.5	2	3.2	3	6.0
2,500 - 2,999	1	1.8	1	1.6	-	-
3,000 - 3,499	-	-	1	1.6	3	6.0
Greater than 3,500	1	1.8	2	3.2	1	2.0
As Needed	12	21.1	4	6.3	15	30.0

Table 30
Membership of Current Vocational Agricultural Teachers in Professional Organizations

Organization	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent*
Florida Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association	52	72.2
National Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association	34	47.2
Florida Vocational Association	36	50.0
American Vocational Association	21	29.1
Other	36	50.0

*Percent based on 72 responses from current teachers of vocational agriculture.

Table 31 reflects the response to this question posed to the respondents: If it were possible to start college over, would you major in Agricultural Education? Ninety-five (72.5%) indicated they would major in agricultural education if they were to start college over again. Thirty (22.9%) indicated they would not major in agricultural education and six (4.6%) were undecided.

Table 31
Graduates' Intention to Major in Agricultural Education Again

Major in Agricultural Education	Responses	
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	95	72.5
No	30	22.9
Undecided	6	4.6

Conclusions

Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions were made:

1. Graduates perceived the adequacy of the coursework they received as above average to good in the areas of pre-professional studies, technical agriculture, and agricultural education.

2. Graduates rated the coursework received in agricultural education the highest, followed by technical agriculture coursework, and pre-professional coursework. Student teaching received the highest rating by the graduates.

3. Graduates believed that the amount of technical agricultural coursework received by agricultural education students should be increased while the amount of pre-professional and agricultural education coursework should be maintained at its present level.

4. Graduates perceived the quality of advisement and teaching by the faculty to be of very high quality.

5. Most graduates were members of the Agricultural Education Society. Participation in AES was perceived to be between "some" and "much" value to the graduates.

6. Graduates tended to be male, married, living in small communities, teaching in single teacher vocational agriculture departments, living relatively close to their hometowns, and having or are in the process of completing educational coursework or degrees beyond the bachelor's degree level.

7. Over 75% of the graduates intended to teach vocational agriculture after graduation and 66.9% of the graduates are currently teachers in some field. Almost 60% are current vocational agriculture teachers. Sixty-five percent of the graduates earn $20,000 or more per year. Almost 5% earn $40,000 or above.

8. Most graduates who were teaching vocational agriculture belonged to the FVATA and FAV. Most do not belong to NVATA and AVA.

9. Almost three quarters of the graduates would major in agricultural and extension education again, about 5% were undecided.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions drawn from this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. This study should be used by faculty and administrators as they examine the effectiveness and quality of the teacher education program within the department.

2. Efforts should continue to be made to maintain the quality of teaching and advisement students receive in the department.

3. This study should be shared with students as a basis of providing career information.

4. This study should be replicated annually to provide current information about graduates.

APPENDIX A

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA 32611

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

305 ROLFS HALL

PHONE: 904/392-0502

September 22, 1986

Dear Graduate:

We in the Agricultural and Extension Education Department at the University of Florida are in the process of conducting a follow-up study of our graduates from 1975 through 1985. It is intended to provide evidence concerning how effective selected aspects of the program in agricultural education were in preparing you for a career. Studies of this nature are very important in helping us analyze and improve our agricultural education program. We would appreciate it very much if you would take a few minutes to fill out the survey and return it in the enclosed self addressed stamped envelope. Information on each graduate is essential if the study is to be accurate.

All of your responses will remain confidential. The number on the questionnaire is only for record keeping and follow-up purposes.

We hope that you will help us improve the Agricultural and Extension Education Department by returning the completed survey in the enclosed self addressed, stamped envelope by October 1, 1986.

Thank you so much for your time, effort, and support.

Sincerely,

Max B. McGhee	Jimmy G. Cheek	Juan R. Rancharan
Professor	Professor	Graduate Assistant

MBM/JGC/JRR/ldk
Enclosure

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION CENTER FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA 32611

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

305 ROLFS HALL

PHONE: 904/392-0502

October 20, 1986

Dear Graduate:

About three weeks ago you should have received a questionnaire for a follow-up study we are conducting on our Agricultural Education graduates from 1975-1985. Information on each graduate is essential if the study is to be accurate. To date we have not heard from you. Would you take a few minutes and complete the enclosed questionnaire so that we can include your data in our study.

Thanks for your prompt reply. If you have already returned your completed questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please do so as soon as possible.

Thanks so much for your assistance in this important effort.

Sincerely,

Max B. McGhee	Jimmy G. Cheek	Juan R. Rancharan
Professor	Professor	Graduate Assistant

MBM/JGC/JRR/ldk
Enclosure

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION CENTER FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA 32611

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

305 ROLFS HALL

PHONE: 904/392-0502

October 27, 1987

Dear Graduate:

A week ago you should have received a questionnaire for a follow-up study we are conducting on our Agricultural Education graduates from 1975-1985. Information on each graduate is essential if the study is to be accurate. To date we have not heard from you. Would you take a few minutes and complete the questionnaire so that we can include your data in our study.

Thanks for your prompt reply. If you have already returned your completed questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please do so as soon as possible.

Thanks so much for your assistance in this important effort.

Sincerely,

Max B. McGhee
Professor

Jimmy G. Cheek
Professor

Juan R. Rancharan
Graduate Assistant

MBM/JGC/JRR/ldk
Enclosure

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION CENTER FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA 32611

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

305 ROLFS HALL

PHONE: 904/392-0502

October 28, 1986

Dear Graduate:

We in the Agricultural and Extension Education Department at the University of Florida are in the process of conducting a follow-up study of our graduates from 1975 through 1985. It is intended to provide evidence concerning how effective selected aspects of the program in agricultural education were in preparing you for a career. Studies of this nature are very important in helping us analyze and improve our agricultural education program. We would appreciate it very much if you would take a few minutes to fill out the survey and return it in the enclosed self addressed, stamped envelope. Information on each graduate is essential if the study is to be accurate.

All of your responses will remain confidential. The number on the questionnaire is only for record keeping and follow-up purposes.

We hope that you will help us improve the Agricultural and Extension Education Department by returning the completed survey in the enclosed self addressed, stamped envelope by November 5, 1986.

Thank you so much for your time, effort, and support.

Sincerely,

Max B. McGhee
Professor

Jimmy G. Cheek
Professor

Juan R. Rancharan
Graduate Assistant

MBM/JGC/JRR/ldk
Enclosure

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION CENTER FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.

APPENDIX E

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA 32611

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

305 ROLFS HALL

PHONE: 904/392-0502

November 4, 1986

Dear Graduate:

Two weeks ago you should have received a questionnaire for a follow-up study we are conducting on our Agricultural Education graduates from 1975-1985. Information on each graduate is essential if the study is to be accurate. To date we have not heard from you. Would you take a few minutes and complete the questionnaire so that we can include your data in our study.

Thanks for your prompt reply. If you have already returned your completed questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please do so as soon as possible.

Thanks so much for your assistance in this important effort.

Sincerely,

Max B. McGhee	Jimmy G. Cheek	Juan R. Rancharan
Professor	Professor	Graduate Assistant

MBM/JGC/JRR/ldk

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION CENTER FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

INSTITUTE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

GAINESVILLE, FLORIDA 32611

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
AND EXTENSION EDUCATION

305 ROLFS HALL

PHONE: 904/392-0502

November 7, 1986

Dear Graduate:

Three weeks ago you should have received a questionnaire for a follow-up study we are conducting on our Agricultural Education graduates from 1975-1985. Information on each graduate is essential if the study is to be accurate. To date we have not heard from you. Would you take a few minutes and complete the enclosed questionnaire so that we can include your data in our study.

Thanks for your prompt reply. If you have already returned your completed questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please do so as soon as possible.

Thanks so much for your assistance in this important effort.

Sincerely,

Max B. McGhee
Professor

Jimmy G. Cheek
Professor

Juan R. Rancharan
Graduate Assistant

MBM/JGC/JRR/ldk
Enclosure

COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE
SCHOOL OF FOREST RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION CENTER FOR TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

The Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences is an Equal Employment Opportunity - Affirmative Action Employer authorized to provide research, educational information and other services only to individuals and institutions that function without regard to race, color, sex, or national origin.

APPENDIX F

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY
AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION GRADUATES
1975 TO 1985
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

In the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope, please return the completed instrument to:

Department of Agricultural and Extension Education
305 Rolfs Hall
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611

Code Number _____

Part I

1. **Directions:** In view of your college and post-college experiences and present occupation, rate, by circling the most appropriate response, **THE ADEQUACY OF COURSEWORK YOU RECEIVED** in these areas. Responses are (1) poor, (2) fair, (3) average, (4) good, or (5) excellent.

Coursework	ADEQUACY OF COURSEWORK Poor 1	Fair 2	Average 3	Good 4	Excellent 5
1. Pre-professional courses					
a. English	1	2	3	4	5
b. Social & Behavioral Sciences	1	2	3	4	5
c. Humanities	1	2	3	4	5
d. Mathematics	1	2	3	4	5
e. Economics	1	2	3	4	5
f. Sciences (Chemistry, Biology, & Physics)	1	2	3	4	5
g. Communications (Speech & Ag. Journalism)	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Adequacy of Pre-professional Courses	1	2	3	4	5
2. Technical Agriculture:					
a. Agricultural Economics	1	2	3	4	5
b. Agricultural Mechanics	1	2	3	4	5
c. Agronomy	1	2	3	4	5
d. Animal Science	1	2	3	4	5
e. Entomology	1	2	3	4	5
f. Horticulture	1	2	3	4	5
g. Soils	1	2	3	4	5
h. Other (Specify)_____ _____	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Adequacy of Technical Agriculture Courses	1	2	3	4	5

Part I Question 1 (cont.).

Coursework	ADEQUACY OF COURSEWORK 1 Poor	2 Fair	3 Average	4 Good	5 Excellent
3. Agricultural Education:					
a. Teaching Methods	1	2	3	4	5
b. Special Methods of Teaching	1	2	3	4	5
c. Youth Programs	1	2	3	4	5
d. Program Planning	1	2	3	4	5
e. Principles & Philosophy	1	2	3	4	5
f. Student Teaching/Internship	1	2	3	4	5
Overall Adequacy of Agricultural Education Courses	1	2	3	4	5

2. Indicate if you believe the amount of coursework required in the Agricultural Education program should be 1) decreased, (2) maintained, or (3) increased in the following areas.

Type of Coursework	AMOUNT OF COURSEWORK REQUIRED 1 Decreased	2 Maintained	3 Increased
1. Pre-Professional Courses (English, Chemistry, Math, etc)	1	2	3
2. Technical Agriculture Courses (Animal Science, Agricultural Mechanics, etc.)	1	2	3
3. Agricultural Education Courses	1	2	3
4. Other Areas (Please Specify)_____ _____	1	2	3

Part II

Please respond to the following statements in relation to the academic advisement you received by the faculty in the Department of Agricultural and Extension Education at UF. Circle the response most nearly expressing your perception using the following scale:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree
6. Not Applicable

		QUALITY OF ADVISEMENT					
	Advisement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
A.	They helped me in getting the courses I needed	1	2	3	4	5	NA
B.	They helped me in getting the experiences I wanted from college	1	2	3	4	5	NA
C.	They were well qualified to advise students	1	2	3	4	5	NA
D.	They were readily available when needed	1	2	3	4	5	NA
E.	They were friendly and cooperative	1	2	3	4	5	NA
F.	They made an effort to become acquainted with my problems	1	2	3	4	5	NA
G.	They appeared to be happy to be of assistance to me	1	2	3	4	5	NA
H.	They provided information and assistance for further education	1	2	3	4	5	NA
I.	They provided information and assisted me in getting a job	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Part III

Please circle the response which best applies to the Agricultural and Extension faculty who taught you.

Teaching Behavior	QUALITY: Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1. The points the professors made in class were clear and easy to understand	1	2	3	4	5	NA
2. The professors used a variety of teaching methods, books, equipment, examples, etc., to explain class material	1	2	3	4	5	NA
3. The professors seemed alert and enthusiastic about the subject	1	2	3	4	5	NA
4. The professors generally stayed on the subject during class	1	2	3	4	5	NA
5. The professors frequently asked questions and used students ideas in class	1	2	3	4	5	NA
6. Other (Please specify) _____ _____	1	2	3	4	5	NA

Part IV

Collegiate FFA/Ag Ed Society and Other Organizations

1. Indicate your level of participation in the Agricultural Education Society (formerly Collegiate FFA) at the University of Florida.

   A. _____ Not a member

   B. _____ Paid dues but not involved

   C. _____ Somewhat actively involved

   D. _____ Very actively involved

2. If you were a member, how valuable was involvement in the Ag Ed Society/Collegiate FFA for you?

Organization Benefits	VALUE: None	Little	Some	Much	Very Much
A. Helped me understand Agricultural Education/Vocational Agriculture better	1	2	3	4	5
B. Helped me develop leadership skills	1	2	3	4	5
C. Helped me accept and carry out responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
D. Helped me work with people	1	2	3	4	5
E. Helped me develop skills needed in my current job	1	2	3	4	5
F. Made me aware of career possibilities	1	2	3	4	5

3. Were you a member of any other organization(s) while attending the University of Florida?

A. _____ Yes

B. _____ No

If YES, identify the organization(s) of which you were a member.

____ Agricultural Student Council ____ Agronomy-Soils Club

____ Alpha Gamma Rho ____ Alpha Zeta

____ Block & Bridle Club ____ Gamma Sigma Delta

____ Other (Please Specify) _____

_____

Part V

Directions: Please respond to the following items.

1. What is your age? _____years

2. Are you ____Female ____Male?

3. What is your marital status?

____Single ____Married ____Separated ____Divorced ____Widowed

4. Where do you currently live?

a. City _____ State _____

b. Indicate the population of the city or town you currently live in (check one)

____ Less than 10,000

____ 10,000 - 29,999

____ 30,000 - 49,999

____ 50,000 - 100,000

____ Over 100,000

c. What is the approximate distance of the city/town you currently live in from your hometown? _____ miles

d. **(If applicable)** What is the approximate distance from your spouse's hometown? _____miles

5. What is your current highest level of education?

____ Undergraduate degree

____ Undergraduate degree and graduate courses

____ Master's degree

____ Master's degree with additional graduate courses

____ Doctor's degree

6. How many job positions have you held since graduating from UF? _____

7. What was your first job after graduation?

Job Title _____ Employer _____

Length of Employment in your first job _____ year(s)

8. What is your present job?

Job Title _____ Employer _____

Length of Employment in your present job _____ year(s)

9. Annual Gross Salary earned in your FIRST job after graduation and on your PRESENT job. Put a check mark on the appropriate box. (This information will be held confidentially.)

	Below $10,000	$10,000 - $14,999	$15,000 - $19,999	$20,000 - $24,999	$25,000 - $29,999	$30,000 - $34,999	$35,000 - $39,999	$40,000 and above
First Job Starting Salary								
Present Job Current Salary								

IF YOU EVER TAUGHT OR ARE CURRENTLY TEACHING VO-AG, PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS. IF NOT, PLEASE GO TO ITEM 19.

10. Number of years of Vo-Ag teaching experience? _____

11. Please indicate numbers of years in each type of Vo-Ag department.

    Single teacher department _____ years

    Multi-teacher department _____ years

12. Please indicate what type of department are you now teaching in.

    ____ Single teacher department ____ Multi-teacher department, How many teachers?___

13. If you are currently teaching, what is the approximate length of your contract?

    ____ 10 month

    ____ 11 month

    ____ 12 month

    ____ Other (Please specify) _____

14. How many classes do you teach per day? _____ classes

15. What is the approximate number of hours you work per week? _____ hours

16. Do you get a Salary Supplement? _____ YES _____ NO

    If so, how much? _____

17. Please indicate your approximate budget allocations for the following items for the 1986 -87 school year for your department.

Traveling Budget? $_____

Operating Budget? $_____

Equipment Budget? $_____

18. Please identify the professional organization(s) that you are currently a member.

_____ FVATA _____ NVATA _____ FVA

_____ AVA _____ Other (Please Specify) _____

_____

19. Please make any additional comments you wish concerning the Agricultural Education program at the University of Florida.

_____

_____

_____

20. If you were starting college again, would you enroll in agricultural education

☐ YES ☐ NO

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME IN COMPLETING THIS INSTRUMENT!!
WE APPRECIATE IT SO MUCH.

RETURN TO:
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL AND EXTENSION EDUCATION
305 ROLFS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, FL 32611

Appendix G

Annual Gross Salary for Graduates' Current Job, 1986-1987, by Year of Graduation

Year	< 10		10 - 14.9		15 - 19.9		20 - 24.9		25 - 29.9		30 - 34.9		35 - 39.9		40+	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1975							1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	1	16.7	2	33.3
1976	2	33.3					1	16.7	2	33.3	1	16.7				
1977	1	8.3			4	33.3	3	25.0	2	16.7	1	8.3			1	8.3
1978					3	50.0	2	33.3					1	16.7		
1979			1	7.1			8	57.1	3	21.4	1	7.1			1	7.1
1980			1	7.1	4	28.6	5	35.7	1	7.1	3	21.4				
1981	2	15.4	1	7.7	2	15.4	5	38.5	2	15.4					1	7.7
1982			1	8.3	7	58.3	4	33.3								
1983					1	16.7	5	83.3								
1984			2	9.1	7	31.8	11	50.0	2	9.1						
1985	1	8.3			3	25.0	6	50.0	1	8.3	1	8.3				

Current Gross Annual Salary by Contract Length and Teacher vs Non-Teacher

Length	< 10		10 - 14.9		15 - 19.9		20 - 24.9		25 - 29.9		30 - 34.9		35 - 39.9		40+	
10 mos.			2	8.7	15	65.2	6	26.1								
11 mos.					3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3						
12 mos.			1	3.3	21	70.0	7	23.3	1	3.3						
Other			1	4.0	7	28.0	14	56.0	3	12.0						
Non-Teach	4	11.8*	2	5.9	4	11.8	7	20.6	3	8.8	7	20.6	2	5.9	5	14.7

*Mostly part-time.

81

References

Burnett, M. F., & Yahya, I. B. (1987, December). Assessment of preservice preparation by recent graduates of agricultural education programs. Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual National Agricultural Education Research Meeting. Las Vegas, Nevada.

Denton, J. J. Adequacy of teacher preparation programs as perceived by graduates of agricultural education, industrial education and education curriculum and instruction. The Journal of Vocational Education Research, 4 (1), 65-78.

Noeth, R. J. & Hanson, G. R. Education and employment of post-secondary vocational-technical and transfer education students after five years. The Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1 (3), 15-30.